

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 **1. CALL TO ORDER** – Chair Barbara Ronningen called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM
- 6
- 7 **2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** – was recited.
- 8
- 9 **3. ROLL CALL** – Present: Chair Barbara Ronningen, Sally Doherty, Kris Kopitzke, Lucia Wroblewski, Mark
10 Nelson, Jim Langan (missed portion of meeting), Scott Patten, Roger Bowman A Quorum was present.
11 **ALSO IN ATTENDANCE** – City Council member Joe Richter, City Administrator Ron Moore, City Clerk
12 Julie Yoho
13
- 14 **4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA** – Add items 8a. “Attendance at January City Council meeting” 8 b. “Renewal of
15 Terms”, 9a. Afton Creek Preserve
16 **Motion/Second: Patten/Nelson To approve agenda of the January 8, 2018 Planning Commission**
17 **Meeting as amended. Passed 7-0-0.**
18
- 19 **5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES** –
20 A. November 29, 2017 Work Session Meeting minutes - **Motion/Second: Wroblewski/Patten To**
21 **approve minutes of the November 29, 2017 Work Session. Passed 7-0-0**
22 B. December 4, 2017 Meeting Minutes – **Motion/Second: Wroblewski/Patten To approve minutes of the**
23 **December 4, 2017 meeting minutes with changes noted. Passed 6-0-1**
24
- 25 **6. REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS** – none
26
- 27 **7. PUBLIC HEARINGS** – none
28
- 29 **8. NEW BUSINESS** –
30 A. Attendance at January City Council meeting
31 Wroblewski will attend
32
33 B. Renewal of Commissioner terms
34 Administrator Moore will review terms and forward the information.
35 Chair Ronningen noted that a representative from Ward 4 is needed.
36
37 C. Afton Creek Preserve
38 **Motion/Second Ronningen/Patten To recommend to the City Council that the preliminary plat**
39 **application for a PLCD for Afton Creek Preserve be denied. Alternatively applicant should be**
40 **asked to withdraw his preliminary plat application with refund of any application fees not used by**
41 **the city and resubmit an application with one proposed preliminary plat drawing that meets the**
42 **City of Afton’s ordinances without the need for a rezoning or variances.**
43 **Findings:**
44 1) **The application requires a variance for more than 9 lots on a cul-de-sac**
45 2) **The application requires a variance to join a lot to the PLCD that has already been**
46 **subdivided to its maximum density which is disallowed by the PLCD ordinance**
47 3) **The question of rezoning a RR parcel so that it can be included in the PLCD has not been**
48 **adequately addressed, but appears to be disallowed by the PLCD ordinance**
49 4) **The application has been incomplete and still lacks complete slope data that has been**
50 **requested**
51 5) **The issue re: stormwater runoff has not been addressed adequately**
52 6) **The traffic issue has not been studied adequately with a traffic study taking place during a**
53 **holiday week and while there was construction in the area**

- 54 7) **The traffic study did not adequately address the safety impacts of traffic increases along the**
55 **Trading Post curve, the substandard road width along the Trading Post curve, the private**
56 **driveway in the tangent of the curve, or the increased traffic speed if the road were to be**
57 **paved**
- 58 8) **The traffic study did not adequately address the safety impacts traveling south on 60th Street**
59 **from the proposed access point related to traffic increases, curves, substandard road width,**
60 **inadequate sight lines, speed if the road were to be paved, or intersection quality at Oakgreen.**
- 61 9) **Currently, there are no less than 3 plans for this application. Applicant needs to submit one**
62 **final and complete plan to be considered.**
- 63 10) **Lot sizes and lot layout are questionable with at least one lot having a very odd shape.**
- 64 11) **The issue of the field access road off of Trading Post has not been addressed (potentially**
65 **leaving no purpose for the access road leading to its abandonment and regrowth in invasive**
66 **species)**
- 67 12) **The southern boundary of the shoreland district boundary is not shown on the preliminary**
68 **plat application maps**
- 69 13) **The question of whether the PLCD is a PUD within Afton ordinances requiring the removal**
70 **of shoreland district acreage from the PLCD has not be adequately addressed or reflected on**
71 **the preliminary plat application maps.**
- 72 14) **Access road setbacks from the Graham property need to be confirmed so that the setbacks**
73 **are fully adhered to and do not place an encumbrance on the Graham property in the future.**

74 **Discussion**

75 Chair Ronningen stated she would like to be very clear where the planning commission stands

76 Patten stated that this application has been extended willingly by the applicant, but continues to go on.

77 We've been clear we'd like a plan with no variances.

78 Kopitzke stated this looks like what has been discussed, but we've never had a motion

79 Wroblewski noted that the applicant keeps coming back with the same things & that she likes the idea of
80 starting with something new.

81 Doherty stated that the process is for the PC to give feedback on the preliminary plat. We could give written
82 feedback without denying. You're suggesting denying.

83 Chair Ronningen pointed out that the latest extension ends Feb 11.

84 Administrator Moorse stated that the applicant has extended 60 more days from Feb 11.

85 Chair Ronningen stated she tried to put all the problems with the project in writing. It would be best to start
86 from beginning and adhere to the ordinances.

87 Nelson asked if the title transfer question has been looked into?

88 Administrator Moorse replied that the documents he's seen relate to Ag Preserve

89 Wroblewski asked what fees are we looking at and how does that work to refund?

90 Administrator Moorse replied that there were 3 applications with fees and escrow deposit to cover review
91 costs. In the past the council would allow original deposit to carry over to a new plan.

92 Patten stated that it is a simple ordinance, does not require negotiation, is black and white. Resubmit an
93 application that follows.

94 Chair Ronningen stated that the variances requests seem to be for economic purposes

95 Nelson pointed out that variances cannot be granted for only economic reasons, but can be based on others

96 Chair Ronningen stated that over 9 houses on a cul de sac seems to be only an economic benefit

97 Nelson stated that if there are other benefits, then they can be allowed

98 Doherty suggested having fewer findings and label the more subjective ones "feedback". Number 7 – the
99 engineers would not agree with that. The neighborhood had concerns but the engineers defend. Not
100 comfortable with that being a finding.

101 Council member Richter stated that the traffic study is very narrow and didn't look at the broader
102 community.

103 Kopitzke pointed out there is not enough consensus on the traffic issues. Vehicle counts over 24 hr. period
104 result in average that may be too low.

105 Doherty would like to rewrite item 7

106 Council member Richter pointed out that the vehicles are not just car trips, but buses, garbage etc.
107 Chair Ronningen stated that the traffic study left us wanting more
108 Patten asked whether the “odd shape lots” is a philosophy or written in ordinance?
109 Doherty answered that it is stated in ordinance language.
110 Bowman asked why “odd shape” is in findings?
111 Chair Ronningen answered because the lot shape was discussed numerous times and nothing changed.
112 Patten stated that we disagree with the traffic study because it was done over a holiday week. They stand
113 by what they’ve done but we believe it’s flawed due to timing.
114 Doherty commented that we are stuck because the applicant can do another study next week and the
115 community still won’t agree with or have confidence in.
116 Langan stated that you can pick and choose engineers. Studies can be very subjective. Really need a non-
117 engaged 3rd party.
118 Wroblewski commented that the study did not look at 60th or the broader impact
119 Doherty asked if we want concessions that make the neighborhood more comfortable?
120 Chair Ronningen replied that our job is to adhere to Afton’s Ordinances, the health & safety of Afton
121 residents. Not our job to make people comfortable.
122 **Ronningen/Patten amended language to replace findings 6,7 & 8 with:**
123 **6). The traffic issue has not been studied adequately with a traffic study taking place during a**
124 **holiday week and while there was road construction in the area. It did not address safety impacts of**
125 **traffic increases, substandard road width, private driveways or increased traffic speed if road were**
126 **to be paved.**
127 **Motion vote, passed 8-0-0.**

128
129 **9. OLD BUSINESS –**

130 A. Comprehensive Plan Update process

131 James Langan provided a presentation regarding groundwater & water supply protection.

132
133 The Comprehensive Plan was reviewed and edits noted. A public hearing will be held in February.

134
135 B. Update on City Council Actions

136 1. Council highlights from the December 19, 2017 Council meeting.

137 Council member Richter provided a summary from the meeting. The Council will hold a workshop on
138 January 9 to discuss the issue of PLCD v.s. PUD.

139
140 **10. ADJOURN**

141 **Motion/Second Wroblewski/Bowman “God yes”, to adjourn. Passed 8-0-0.**

142
143 Meeting adjourned at 9:45 pm

144
145
146
147 Respectfully submitted by:

148
149 JY

150 Julie Yoho, City Clerk

151
152
153 **To be approved on February 5, 2018 as (check one): Presented: _____ or Amended: X**